

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 12, 15 and 21-22 are amended. Claims 2-4 were previously canceled. New dependent Claims 23-24 are added. Hence, Claims 1 and 5-24 are pending in this application.

#### I. STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

The Examiner spoke by telephone to the applicants' representatives on November 20, 2009. To the extent that the call of November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009, constituted an interview of the Examiner, applicants provide the following statement of the substance of the Interview: the Examiner indicated that the amendments to Claim 1 made Claim 1 allowable, and that Claims 1, 12, 15, 21 and 22 should be amended in a consistent manner. Requested amendments are submitted herewith.

#### II. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1 and 5-11 are allowed. (Final Office Action: page 3)

#### III. ISSUES NOT RELATING TO PRIOR ART

##### CLAIM 15 -- OBJECTIONS

Claim 15 is objected because the phrase "network interference" recited in Claim 15 should read "network interface." (Final Office Action, page 2)

Applicants believe that the objection is fully addressed by amended Claim 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### IV. ISSUES RELATING TO ALLEGED PRIOR ART

##### A. CLAIMS 12-20 AND 22 – 35 U.S.C. §103(a): HEFETZ, KNIEST

The Final Office Action states that Claims 12-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hefetz et al., U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0123238 ("Hefetz") in view of Kniest, U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0156864 ("Kniest"). (Final Office Action, page 3) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

##### CLAIM 12

Present Claim 12 recites features similar to those in Claim 1, which is allowed. The

present amendments to Claim 12 are the same as those to Claim 1 submitted in the previous Reply. Claim 12 is allowable for the same reason as Claim 1.

Indeed, Hefetz and Kniest, individually or in combination, fail to describe or suggest “including into the at least one dynamic portion of the channel portal template links to content cached in the content engine, where including links ... comprises checking a replication status of the content engine to determine available cached content, inserting into the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template links to content found in the replication status, and hiding at least one link to content not found in the replication status in the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template;” and “inserting into the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template information about content availability to generate a portal page, where inserting information about content availability comprises comparing a replication status to a catalog of files carried in the content engine to determine what files are locally cached and what files remain to be downloaded, and writing a list of files that remain to be downloaded to the portal page with an indicator of unavailability,” recited in Claim 12.

The Office Action acknowledges that Hefetz is silent about links to cached content. (Final Office Action: page 4) However, the Office Action alleges that, in paragraph [306], Kniest describes including the links to content that is cached in a content engine. (Final Office Action: page 4) This is incorrect.

In paragraph [306], Kniest merely states that a cache forward engine gathers information in advance and uses currently viewed content for links to other web sites, but does not describe including links to content cached, as recited in Claim 12. Kniest does not describe that including links to cached content in the content engine comprises checking a replication status of the content engine to determine available cached content, inserting into at least one dynamic portion of the portal template links to content found in the replication status and hiding at least one link to content that was not found in the replication status in the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template, as claimed. Further, Kniest does not insert into the dynamic portion of the

portal template information about content availability to generate a portal page by comparing a replication status to a catalog of files carried in the content engine to determine what files are locally cached and what files remain to be downloaded. Moreover, Kniest does not write a list of files that remain to be downloaded to the portal page with an indicator of unavailability, as recited in Claim 12.

Even in combination, Hefetz and Kniest fail to disclose the recited approach. A combination of Hefetz and Kniest might provide a method for designing and deploying portal pages, and, upon displaying a portal page to a user, allowing the user to select and follow links displayed on the portal page. However, no combination provides a way for checking a replication status of the content engine to determine available cached content, inserting into the dynamic portion of the portal template links to content found in the replication statuses, hiding links to content that is not found in the replication status, ... and writing a list of files that remain to be downloaded to the portal page with an indicator of unavailability, as claimed.

Therefore, Hefetz and Kniest, individually or in combination, fail to describe or suggest all features of Claim 12. Hence, Claim 12 is patentable over Hefetz and Kniest.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CLAIM 15

Claim 15 recites features similar to those in Claim 12 but in a form of a content engine. Thus, Claim 15 is patentable over Hefetz and Kniest for the same reasons as Claim 12.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CLAIM 22

Claim 22 recites features similar to those in Claim 12 but in a form of a computer-readable medium. Thus, Claim 22 is patentable over Hefetz and Kniest for the same reasons as Claim 12. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### NEW CLAIMS 23-24

New dependent Claims 23-24 are directed to a computer-readable medium that is

encoded with instructions, which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform the steps recited in Claims 13-14.

New Claims 23-24 depend directly from Claim 22 that has been discussed. Therefore, Claims 23-24 are patentable for the reasons given above. In addition, each of Claims 23-24 separately introduces features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite positive resolution of the examination, separate arguments are not provided for each of the dependent claims at this time.

**B. CLAIM 21 – 35 U.S.C. §103(a): HEFETZ, KNIEST, BRYAN**

The Final Office Action states that Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hefetz in view of Kniest, and further in view of Bryan et al., U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0146015 (“Bryan”). (Final Office Action, page 9) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Present Claim 21 recites features similar to those in Claim 1, which is allowed. Present amendments to Claim 12 are the same as those to Claim 1 submitted in the previous Reply that made Claim 1 allowable.

Bryan does not cure the deficiencies of Hefetz and Kniest with respect to the above limitations. In fact, the Office Action cites Bryan merely to allegedly describe a cache portal template, not to allegedly describe the above limitations. Bryan describes an individual template of a portal that can be updated with the user’s specified keywords and customized to the user’s specific needs. (Bryan: Para [60]) However, Bryan fails to describe checking a replication status of the content engine to determine available cached content, inserting into the dynamic portion of the portal template links to content found in the replication statues, hiding links to content that is not found in the replication status, ... and writing a list of files that remain to be downloaded to the portal page with an indicator of unavailability, as claimed.

Even in combination, Hefetz, Kniest and Bryan fail to describe the claimed approach. A combination might provide a method for designing, customizing and deploying portal pages, and,

upon displaying a portal page to a user, allowing the user to select and follow links displayed on the portal page. However, no combination provides the method recited in Claim 21.

Therefore, Hefetz, Kniest and Bryan, individually or in combination, fail to describe or suggest all features of Claim 21. Hence, Claim 21 is patentable over Hefetz, Kniest and Bryan.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### C. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The claims that are not discussed above depend directly or indirectly on the claims that have been discussed. Therefore, those claims are patentable for the reasons given above. In addition, each of the dependent claims separately introduces features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite positive resolution of the examination, separate arguments are not provided for each of the dependent claims at this time.

#### V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A petition for an extension of time is hereby made to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any applicable fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: December 10, 2009

/Malgorzata A Kulczycka#50496/

Malgorzata A. Kulczycka

Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1228

Serial No. 11/736,436; Filed 12/15/2003  
Reply to Final Office Action

Docket No. 50325-1629

Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076